

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

5-22-2013

Periodic Review of College Deans

Robert Costomiris
Georgia Southern University

Faculty Welfare Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Costomiris, Robert and Faculty Welfare Committee, "Periodic Review of College Deans" (2013). *Faculty Senate Index*. 246.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/246>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 6-4-2013

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 6-10-2013

Not Approved by the President:

Periodic Review of College Deans

Submitted by Robert Costomiris/Faculty Welfare Committee

5/22/2013

Motion:

In the fifth year of a Dean's tenure (or earlier if requested by 30% of the college's voting membership) the Provost shall conduct a comprehensive review of the College Dean. This review shall include input from a broad spectrum of constituents including faculty, staff, administrators, students, and the community served by the College. After reviewing all of the material presented by the Dean, the report of the Committee established to assess the Dean's impact on the college, and the results of the review by the college faculty, the Provost will decide if the Dean shall continue employment in that role. Whatever the Provost decides, he/she will make available in writing to all interested parties an explanation of his/her decision.

Rationale:

In the interests of shared governance, the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the above motion be approved by the Faculty Senate. It is the Committee's intention that the details of this policy be clarified and established by the Faculty Welfare Committee in consultation with the Provost at the start of Fall Semester 2013 so that a completed policy can be presented and voted upon at the October 2013 Faculty Senate meeting.

Response:

6/4/2013: Faculty Welfare Committee Motion: Periodic Review of College Deans:

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) read the motion into the record (motion posted online) and moved its approval.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) noted the first sentence called only for a review after five years and none thereafter, and suggested revising to “every fifth year.” He offered this as a friendly amendment, Costomiris accepted it, and there were no objections.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) asked the Provost’s opinion of the motion.

Provost Bartels was very much in support of a periodic review, noted we already do an annual review of the Deans that includes input from faculty and staff, but thought a designated number of years was appropriate to do a comprehensive review. She asked the committee to work with her to establish procedures to ensure the review is truly comprehensive.

Mark Hanna (COBA) asked if such a periodic review does not already take place. Provost Bartels said the Handbook already says there is to be one, but she’s only one year into her job and while it is now part of the process, she couldn’t say what happened prior to her time.

Hanna then asked for the rationale behind designating thirty percent of the college’s voting membership as a threshold for requesting a review earlier than the five-year period.

Costomiris noted that it’s the same percentage we have in the review of department chairs and was a percentage that Stephanie Sipe recommended as a kind of minimum threshold based on some kind of loyalty thing which she knew much better than he did. He added that the motion “is not fleshed out,” that the specifics will developed in the coming year in concert with the Provost.

Devon Jensen (COE) said that waiting for a five year period might not give a well-liked dean information soon enough to prevent that dean from seeking another job elsewhere. .

Marc Cyr (CLASS) suggested the annual review by the Dean should cover that contingency. He added that one of the things he liked about this motion is that the faculty will be told what the results of this process are, which was not the case now.

The motion was Approved.